



CADPAC Certification Sub-committee

**Minutes
August 7, 2003**

I. Welcome and Attendance

Judge Detamore opened the meeting and welcomed the members. Scott Kruse was welcomed for his first meeting with the sub-committee.

Members present: Hon. James Detamore, Penny Waggy, Art Kozumplik, Debra Farmer, Dean Wilson, Scott Kruse

Staff present: Lori Amsbury, Bill Carey, Cheri Harris

II. Minutes

Minutes from the May 3, 2003 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Ms. Waggy and a second by Mr. Kozumplik. Ms. Amsbury reminded the subcommittee that the draft minutes prior to approval are available on the website, and the sub-committee stated they were happy with the detailed nature of the minutes.

III. Rules Revision.

1. **Discussion.** Mr. Carey presented a memo to the subcommittee regarding consideration of the clinical nature of the certification process and revisions to Section 29 that were not originally included in the draft for public comment. Mr. Carey requested that the subcommittee take a serious look at Section 22 especially with regard to assessment and determine if the rules need to be changed as proposed, left alone or other changes be made to reflect a different avenue of procedure. The possibility of a workgroup looking into criteria and assessment procedures was discussed. Mr. Kruse and Ms. Farmer agreed to co-chair that workgroup if needed. The staff was given the ability to determine if a workgroup is needed based on information gathered at the upcoming Director's Meeting on August 28, 2003 in Columbus. The certification process was discussed at length and several items were considered:

- a. Ms. Amsbury outlined the current review process and stated that a few counties have expressed concern over their comfort level during the review process. Specifically, some directors and staff do not like the clinical file review provided in a group setting with all staff hearing the comments on all other staff files. She also stated that a few other directors have stated they are very comfortable with that process seeing it as a learning experience. The subcommittee stated in general that they are comfortable with the process in place and feel that standards are the main focus not methodology.

9-4-03 Draft

- b. Mr. Wilson brought up some concerns from his Chief Probation Officer stating that she has some concern with the programs using “adapted DSM criteria” and feels a clinical reviewer should hold a PhD or be a Masters level clinician. The subcommittee consensus was that it is not necessary for a reviewer of court programs to have such high credentials since the program staff are not counselors; however what criteria the programs use is worthy of statewide input and discussion at the program level.
 - c. Mr. Kozumplik stated that if clinical standards are not being met by programs, the state and reviewer should be able to back up what the standards are, no matter what standards are chosen. These may not need to be concrete, but general criteria.
 - d. Ms. Harris added that we are currently at a crossroads in certification. Do we back off of what is reviewed in assessments or do we specifically state in the rules what we are looking for in the review.
 - e. Judge Detamore replied that we need to have minimum standards in the rules but they should not have to hold to one particular way of conducting them in practice. We do not want to be puppets of each other. We definitely need to have professional standards for staff and ensure that the programs are not doing a disservice to the clients by sending all people to one type of intervention even if they have had an assessment. He urged the subcommittee toward a review process that allows for the program to have its own philosophy.
 - f. Ms. Waggy stated that assessment is at the core of what programs provide. If the assessment is not accurately and adequately reviewed, then there is no basis for the program certification.
 - g. Ms. Amsbury was asked to describe the issues in Hendricks and Monroe Counties. She replied that each county was not comfortable with the review process in general, stating that there is concern regarding the amount of time taken to conduct reviews, the sensitivity of comfort levels during review, and the interpretation of the current rules for review purposes. Some feeling that the proposed rules are what is being used in the review process instead of the current rules.
 - h. Discussion ensued with a general consensus that the rules need to include the proposed revisions to Section 22.
2. **Review of Comments.** The subcommittee then reviewed and discussed the public comments and program discussion comments made or submitted, since the draft was issued for public comment. They also considered staff comments and suggestions.
3. **Subcommittee Action.** The subcommittee chose to make the following final changes:
- a. delete the terms “alcoholism” and “drug addiction” from Section 4 of definitions since they are only used in the definition of education and revise the definition of education to update to current terminology. (see current draft for language of “education” definition)
 - b. add a reference to compliance with the statute as well as the rules in the definition of “Certification areas” in Section 4.

9-4-03 Draft

- c. revise the term “clinical impression” to read “means the written summary of observations and conclusions of the person who conducted the assessment. The clinical impression includes the result of the assessment and the evidence to support that result.”
- d. revise the language in Sections 7&8 regarding “temporary” certifications to read “one year” certification. Mr. Wilson did state that he does not see a need for a change from temporary since DMHA uses that designation as well; although he indicated not having strong feelings either way. Mr. Kozumplik agreed.
- e. revise the length of time that a supervising judge has to request a hearing from 15 to 30 days in Section 10(c).
- f. revise the language “during orientation” to “during the orientation process” for those who do not call this process orientation in section 20.
- g. delete wording that was not intended to be in the draft “of the program consent” in the last sentence of 20(b)(3).
- h. revise language in section 22(e) to state the ISC “identifies and responds to the clinical impression determined during the assessment.”
- i. change the language in 22(e)(3) to “state the clinical impression determined during the assessment” instead of “identified during the assessment.”
- j. add language in Section 29 stating that staff must adhere to a code of ethics “recognized by IJC” to indicate what ethics are applicable.
- k. delete salary changes, performance evaluations and staff development plans from items needed in the personnel file, while keeping continuing education activities and orientation for new staff in Section 29.*
- l. add the phrase “with some symptoms indicating a progression toward dependence” to the design focus of the advanced education course in Section 31. Also add this phrase to commentary where design focus is stated.
- m. revise language in Section 32 to specify subsection (c) applies to a contract-based program “that is operated by an addiction treatment services provider.”
After considerable discussion of all pertinent points, the subcommittee made a final motion of approval.

* **NOTE:** Item k was requested by Mr. Carey to be revised even though the changes did not go through the entire rules revision process.

- 4. **Subcommittee Approval.** The subcommittee unanimously approved the following motion proposed by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kozumplik.

Motion: That the proposed rules be approved as presented with changes discussed and that they be forwarded for approval by CADPAC at its August 22, 2003 meeting.

9-4-03 Draft

IV. Transfer Policy Proposal

Ms. Harris presented a brief synopsis and full written proposal of transfer guidelines developed by the policy subcommittee. She requested the subcommittee provide comment to the proposed guidelines. Mr. Wilson asked how these guidelines would be reviewed in a year as indicated in the proposal. Ms. Harris indicated a set procedure had not been developed as yet. The subcommittee had no other comments regarding the proposed transfer policy.

V. Next Meeting

The next meeting is not scheduled at this time and date for 2004 meetings are pending.

NOTE: Subsequent to the meeting, the following meeting dates have been scheduled for the subcommittee to meet at the Boone County Courthouse. Each meeting is scheduled 10:00am – 2:00pm unless otherwise indicated prior to the meeting—**November 7, 2003**
2004—February 6th, April 2nd, July 30th, October 29th.

VI. Adjournment

Judge Detamore adjourned the meeting at 3:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 4, 2003

Lori Amsbury, Assistant Administrator
Court Alcohol and Drug Program
Indiana Judicial Center